



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/709,332

04/29/2004

YUI-SHIN FRAN

12889-US-PA

3331

31561

7590

06/16/2006

JIANQ CHYUN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE

7 FLOOR-1, NO. 100

ROOSEVELT ROAD, SECTION 2

TAIPEI, 100

TAIWAN

EXAMINER

HINES, ANNE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2879

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/709,332	Applicant(s) FRAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Anne M. Hines	Art Unit 2879	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: see attachment. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: 9, 13 and 23.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-8, 10-12, 14-22 and 24-26.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
see attached action.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

AMH
6/7/06

MARICELI SANTIAGO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

The claims as amended present new issues requiring further consideration or search. Specifically, independent claims 1, 15, 25, and 26 now require that the lamp serves as a backlight for a liquid crystal display.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment after a final rejection filed on May 30, 2006, has been received but will not be entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed May 30, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues with respect to claims 1, 15, 25, and 26, that in the Nanto reference the light control layer 28 overlaps the entire phosphor film 24, which is different than the requirement of the claims that the intensity of the light emitted from the first light control layer be the same as the intensity of light emitted from portions of the phosphor film 24 not overlapped by the first light control layer.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The phosphor layer 28 comprises three patterned phosphor light control layers—one each for red, green, and blue light. Claims 1, 15, 25, and 26 require that “the intensity of the light emitted from the first light control layer be the same as the intensity of light emitted from portions of the fluorescence layer not overlapped by the first light control layer,” which does not require that the portions of the fluorescence layer not overlapped by the first light control layer are not overlapped by a light control layer that is not the first light control layer. Thus, if the red phosphor layer pattern of 28 is taken as the first light control layer, green as the second light control layer, and blue as the third light control layer, Nanto teaches the requirement of

Art Unit: 2879

equal light intensities being emitted from the first light control layer and areas not having the first light control layer since one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably contemplate that the three control layers (red, green, and blue) of Nanto (Fig. 13, 28; Fig. 1B) will, for a full color display (Column 6, lines 25-29), have the intensity of light exiting from the three control layers (red, green, blue) substantially the same as each of the others for a given pixel in order for that pixel to display white light.

Applicant argues with respect to claims 1, 15, 25 and 26 that the Nanto reference teaches away from the claimed invention because it teaches a light shielding film 45 that interrupts the light emission of the lamp.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claims do not require that the lamp not have a light shielding layer, nor do the claims require that the light emitted from the light exit plane is continuous and uninterrupted across the lamp. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., not having a light shielding layer) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne M. Hines whose telephone number is (571) 272-2285. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00-4:30.

Art Unit: 2879

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Anne M Hines
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2879

AmH
6/7/06

msg
MARICELI SANTIAGO
PRIMARY EXAMINER